UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,141	01/31/2001	Delane Robert Hewett	MCS-059B-00	7735

27662	7590	12/03/2004

LYON & HARR, LLP
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 800
OXNARD, CA 93036

EXAMINER
HENEGHAN, MATTHEW E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/775,141	HEWETT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew Heneghan	2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 January 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>31 January 2001</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-23 have been examined.

Priority

2.   The instant application claims priority to U.S. Patent Application No. 60/237,067,

filed 30 September 2000.

Drawings

3.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4)

because reference character "345" has been used to designate both the Company A

image and the address in figure 3.

4.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4)

because reference character "355" points to the automatically generated Company A

web page in figure 3, but it described as the Company A address in the specification.

5.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)

because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the

description: item "335" on p. 29, line 26.

6.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)

because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the

description: item "340" in figure 3.

7.   Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to

the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with

37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the

application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures

appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being

amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the

page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing

figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified

and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to

the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent No. 5,887,133 to Brown et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,336 to

Schneider et al.

Regarding claim 1, Brown discloses a document generator wherein undesired

portions (frames) in a document are automatically located by a system located on the

Internet (see column 3, line 54) based upon a determination by a proxy server (see

column 3, line 66 to column 4, lines 6). The determination is further based upon the

layout of the intermediate document (see column 4, lines 42-49), which is then delivered

to the user's controller (see column 4, lines 53-57), where it can be further updated

based upon the user profile.

Brown also discloses the use of HTML, a scripting language, for all functionality.

An HTML-generated document retrieved from the Internet is, by definition, a web page

(see column 6, line 44 to column 7, line 66).

Though insecure communications in a secure setting are considered in the art to

be undesirable, Brown does not consider security considerations.

Schneider discloses a distributed access system wherein security levels are used

in Web page construction (see column 45, lines 47-61), and further discloses the raising

of different trust levels in a group of objects to the highest trust level being used (see

column 10, lines 12-19). Schneider further notes that since security adds overhead, an

access filter should neither require nor provide more security than is necessary (see

column 5, lines 41-52).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the invention of Brown by updating insecure portions of a

document, normalizing the security level to the highest level, as disclosed by Schneider,

as a filter should neither require nor provide more security than is necessary.

As per claim 2, a network address (the entry point) is used as an identifier (see

Brown, column 4, lines 27-31).

As per claim 3, HTML is a type of script.

As per claim 4, the HTML script is generated on the remote server.

As per claim 5, the script is then downloaded to the client.

As per claims 6, 7, 9, the web page swapping mechanism can automatically

reside on the client (see Brown, abstract).

As per claim 8 and 18, Brown discloses that the dimensions of a substitute

document be made according to a specification (see Brown, column 9, lines 55-57).

Regarding claim 10, the script must necessarily reside in a computer-readable

medium, such as RAM, before being used.

As per claim 11, the intermediate web page contains variable parameters, such

as the location of the document portion to be called (see Brown, column 8, lines 28-36).

As per claims 12-15, the web page may vary depending upon the caller (see

Brown, column 8, lines 37-67).

As per claim 16, the HTML script generated has no mandatory fields that are

client-specific; therefore, it is also usable by other clients.

Regarding claim 17, Brown discloses the use of user profiles for determining

swaps, but does not suggest that users should be organized according to their security

levels (see Brown, column 10, lines 25-32).

Schneider discloses the organizing of users by access level (see Schneider,

abstract), as this is part of an access policy that determines which users may be given

access to information (see Schneider, column 5, lines 65-66).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to further modify the invention of Brown by using user group

access levels, as disclosed by Schneider, as this is part of an access policy that

determines which users may be given access to information.

Regarding claims 19-22, Brown supports all HTML functionality. Applet support is

a standard HTML function.

Regarding claim 23, Schneider, as cited above, also considers paths (entry

points) in determining security states.

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5,701,342 to Anderson et al. discloses the consideration of

security levels in document construction.

U.S Patent No. 6,546,397 to Rempell discloses a system for constructing web

pages with security considerations.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Matthew E. Heneghan, whose telephone number is

(571) 272-3834. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday,

Thursday, and Friday from 8:30 AM - 4:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gregory Morse, can be reached at (571) 272-3838.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Or faxed to:
(703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-

2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MEH *初任*

November 26, 2004

Andrew Caldwell

Andrew Caldwell